

Bill Miller



To: FAA round table
RE: Agenda Item #9.

Members:

I am a resident of Soquel and I am greatly impacted by the jet noise that I am enduring over the last few years after the flight path was moved from the Big Sur (BSUR) path to the current SERFR path. I live outside of Soquel, away from the city background noise, there it was quiet day and night and peaceful. Now, the jet noise is loud, random at any time 24 hours a day, sometimes serial jet noise with no let up. The often starts at 7 am and continues through the morning or anytime, after 9PM to 1AM and sporadically up to 2:30 AM with the big 747 cargo jets. I can not have my windows open because the noise prevents me from sleep. In the day time, the jet noise is a constant irritation stress me, I just want some peace and quiet. And the jet noise is blasting away ruining everything.

I have been active with FAA meetings and save our Skies for the past 6 years and with hard work we developed a plan to mediate the noise. It was a major effort including the local residents, local officials, FAA and others. It was voted and agreed at the Select Committee on South Bay Arrivals working group. I attended the first SouthBay roundtable meeting and was assured the BSR overlay would be implemented and not up to question. That agreement appears to be in question. The BSR overlay has been voted on, and agreed. If there are aspects of BSR that do not comply with FAA regulations, we can modify the BSR path and not start over, wasting 6 years of hard work. Please be flexible and work with us. We are knowledgeable and flexible and interested with working with you.

Regards
Bill Miller .

From: [Carole Kelley](#)
To: [Angela Montes](#)
Subject: SERFR in Santa Cruz County - #9
Date: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 3:48:01 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Like many mid-peninsula residents, some of us who live in Santa Cruz County (SCC) have been acutely impacted by the change from the BSR flight path to SERFR seven years ago. Airplane noise occurs every 2 to 5 minutes and noise and vibration between 4:30 and 5:45 AM occur nightly, without exception, even though our home is 45 air miles away from SFO. The monthly Noise Reports from SFO Airport Director reflect the change of this noise shift. In the noise report of February 2015, when BSR was in effect, the total number of complaints was 2,209 from 95 reporters. Of the 2,209 complaints only one was from (SCC) from one reporter in Scotts Valley.

March 2015 was when everything changed and numbers dramatically increased. Complaints have been as high as 250,714 from 1,708 reporters in the January 2016 noise report, in which 70,190 complaints came from SCC residents. The most recent report of April 2022 had 112,251 reports from 601 reporters of which 26,285 complaints were from SCC. Monthly and annual numbers vary over time and have significantly been affected by the Covid pandemic. The numbers above are from reporters only and are considerably lower than the actual number of persons who are affected by the ongoing airplane disturbances in our county which is from 40 to 60 air miles from SFO.

We are tired, we want the peace and quiet we had under BSR, and the ability to have a decent and uninterrupted night's sleep. It cannot happen soon enough.

From: [Diane Matlock](#)
To: [Angela Montes](#)
Cc: [Diane Matlock](#)
Subject: Amended SERFER Procedure: Please submit my comments
Date: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 6:17:02 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Please submit the following comments/questions related to the SFO Roundtable agenda item 9. FAA Presentation: Current Status of the Amended SERFER Procedure

The last FAA Workshop on SERFR was devastating. After six years of trusting the FAA, we were simply told that the flight path would not be moved back because the Select Committee criteria could not be met due to safety issues. However, we know the FAA has designed a flight path that would move it back safely, honor the intent of the Select Committee, and meet most of the Select Committee criteria. The FAA developed the exact solution we were looking for and many of us expected it to be implemented. Something or someone stopped the FAA from moving forward and we need honest answers on where the FAA stands on implementing an already developed solution. We know it exists.

So here are my questions:

1. The FAA claimed in the workshop that they just need to understand 'intent' to work with communities. The Select Committee intent was clear: move SERFR back to the original BSUR flight path in a safe manner. Using a couple of the criteria from local representatives as an excuse the FAA can't come up with a safe solution doesn't make sense. The FAA did develop a safe operational procedure to move the flight path back. If this is not being implemented, please explain why.
2. If the FAA is unwilling to move the flight path back under any circumstances, please tell us why. If the FAA is willing to move it back, please let the public know what it will take to make that happen.

Please restore our faith in the FAA and the democratic process that took place 6 years ago and move SERFR back. For many of us that continue to suffer, that is the only way to bring peace back to our skies.

Thank you,

Diane Matlock

From: [MaryJane Donofrio](#)
To: [Angela Montes](#)
Subject: Fwd:
Date: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 6:56:36 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Comment on Agenda # 9. FAA Presentation: Current Status of the Amended SERFR Procedure

At the July FAA Northern California Airspace Workshop the FAA announced they wouldn't return SERFR to it's original BSR ground track, even though a new BSR Overlay procedure was fully developed and safe. This because the FAA could not meet 3 of the Select Committee (SC) recommended criteria.

But from the start, our Reps and the FAA led us to believe the SC bucket list of 50 plus recommendations and criteria weren't meant as mandatory inflexible design specifications. And the FAA always made clear that "the design of the new procedure is ultimately subject to the FAA's design criteria and safety/operational requirements". In their report the Select Committee clarified that they were only layman elected officials and weren't qualified to design safe flight procedures, only the FAA was. See [Select Committee 4.1 Who makes recommendations to whom?](#)

We need the FAA to suggest a path forward to complete the more than 6 years of work done by the FAA, Congressionals, Select Committee, and community members on the BSR overlay without starting over. What will it take?

We worked with and trusted the Select Committee process and were supposed to be the model of community engagement. We are still here. Don't fail us.
MaryJane Donofrio

From:

To:

Subject:

Date:


[Angela Montes](#)

Comment on Agenda # 9. FAA Presentation: Current Status of the Amended SERFR Procedure

Tuesday, May 31, 2022 6:57:10 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

The FAA should move forward with the BSR Overlay. The Select Committee made recommendations, not inflexible mandatory criteria. So other than returning to the BSR ground track, all 9 recommendations do not have to be met to satisfy the intent of the Select Committee, the public or that of our elected Reps'.

The FAA should tell us immediately what path they see for moving forward with implementing the BSR Overlay or a reasonable facsimile thereof. Tell us how can this be accomplished, and without starting over? Tell us, did Anna Eshoo, Jimmy Panetta or Jackie Speier insist all 9 recommendations be met?

The FAA SERFR Workshop was a disgrace. No meaningful public interaction was included. Just the FAA and industry insiders patting themselves on the back for a "mission accomplished" even though nothing was done to help the public, and our Reps' were no where to be seen. I hope this time the FAA and our reps' can do much better.

James Donofrio

From: [Leslie](#)
To: [Angela Montes](#)
Subject: Comments for Agenda Item #9
Date: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 2:36:16 PM

CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.*

Hello Everyone,

I am commenting today requesting we please move forward with the BSR overlay as quickly as possible, previously decided by vote of The Select Committee. The jet noise is so frequent I am unable to get more than about 4.5 hours of uninterrupted sleep per night (documented). I have tried sleeping in a different room, earplugs, white noise machines, fans, etc., but there is nothing that will drown out the sound and vibration of a 747 in the middle of the night, specifically flights KZ109, OZ286 and KE214. I shouldn't know flight numbers at all, but I do. I know the ones from the planes that wake me up every night and then some.

Using FlightAware nightly to see when there will be a break in flights, I rush off to bed praying there isn't any moisture in the air that will cause the jet noise to be even louder than it usually is. Then maybe, just maybe, I can almost pretend to sleep through it. It has been extremely difficult for me to focus on basic tasks, concentrate at work, enjoy family life, or have the energy necessary to function on a daily basis. I am always deathly tired, stressed, and irritable.

One thing I have noticed during the last seven years of the flight path move is when it is raining, the planes are diverted to what looks like the BSR overlay, so It seems like this is something that is able to be implemented safely and quickly.

I moved to my home over 25 years ago and made a conscious decision not to live under a flight path. I had lived under flight paths before, and I knew this was something I did not want for myself or my family in the future.

Today I am asking for the BSR overlay to be implemented. I am so, so

tired.

*Thank you,
Leslie*

From: [Mark](#)
To: [Angela Montes](#)
Subject: 9. FAA Presentation: Current Status of the Amended SERFR Procedure
Date: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 4:50:17 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

I am submitting the following question for consideration in the June1 SFO Roundtable meeting, item 9:

There were 9 sub-recommendations made in Feasibility Group 2 of the Select Committee Report of 2016, written in consultation with Glen Martin of the FAA and considered feasible at that time. Since the NextGen design for the Bay Area Metroplex evolved further after that, it's reasonable to expect that some of the 9 specific sub-recommendations in the Report, such as altitude windows at various waypoints along the BSR track, might need to be adjusted or even eliminated to comply with updated FAA safety criteria and thereby allow a return to the BSR track.

Unfortunately, the FAA has viewed the 9 sub-recommendations as "requirements" or "conditions". These words have often been erroneously applied by the FAA to the sub-recommendations, in numerous communications since 2016. Furthermore, the FAA has viewed the recommendations as unalterable, and they must **all** be feasible, for Feasibility Group 2 to be approved.

This runs counter to the FAA's own statement contained in the FAA's informational animated video presented to the public in its Zoom meetings on July 20 and 21, 2021:

"It is important to clarify that while the Select Committee used the term 'criteria', the FAA views these as Select Committee recommendations. The FAA must apply its own safety criteria to these recommendations."

This statement affirms that the FAA's policy is, or should be, to view the recommendations of the Select Committee as just that--recommendations, not "requirements". And, by extension, the successful application of necessary current safety criteria to recommendations made 5 years earlier may logically require that certain of these recommendations be modified as needed to avoid conflicting with the safety criteria.

Given the FAA's error in interpreting the Select Committee's sub-recommendations, inexplicably viewing them as "requirements", is the FAA now willing to re-examine those recommendations correctly and adjust or modify them to comply with current safety criteria?

Thank you for your consideration!

Mark Joiner

From: [Neil Goldstein](#)
To: [Angela Montes](#)
Subject: R.T. Meeting No. 338 Wednesday, June 1, 2022 - 7:00 p.m agenda item #9 comment
Date: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 6:05:55 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

R.T. Meeting No. 338 Wednesday, June 1, 2022 - 7:00 p.m agenda item #9

Comment for FAA Presentation: Current Status of the Amended SERFR Procedure agenda item #9 6/1/2022

SERFR has been a disaster for my family's health.

Except for a short period where Covid interrupted many flights, my wife and I have not had a real night's sleep since SERFR was implemented.

We are woken from sleep multiple times every night from a few minutes after midnight till well after one A.M. by speed brakes and the rumble of low flying cargo jets that actually shake our house. The horrendous noise starts again well before sunrise.

Earplugs don't help when speed brakes scream in the night, and even if we could block the sound of speed brakes it would also block the sound of a smoke alarm going off if there were a fire in the house. There is no blocking the vibration of our entire house from the cargo jets flying low overhead, engines thundering.

Many jets use their speed brakes approaching Capitola, throttle up as they pass overhead, then use speed brakes again, and again throttle up. The noise is horrendous. Our garden was a source of peace, as well as where we grow our food. Now we endure it. We can't even hold a conversation outside. The stress from the noise is unending inside and outside our home, night and day. None of this noise is necessary. It is the result of poor planning and poorer design. Clearly this procedure wastes fuel and causes more noise and air pollution as well. This must be fixed.

My blood pressure was good. It's not anymore. By days' end the constant noise has left me exhausted and angry. And then there is no sleep, no escape for us.

Neil Goldstein

705 D. 1. 1. 1.



From: [Neil Schaefer](#)
To: [Angela Montes](#)
Cc: [Doreen R. Stockdale](#)
Subject: Re: SFO Community Roundtable 6/1/22 Re Agenda item #9
Date: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 2:29:25 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hi again,

I've made a few short revisions in bold below, including the numbering of my questions. Please could you replace my earlier submission with the one below?
Thanks:

Re SFO Community Roundtable 6/1/22 Agenda Item #9, I submit the following along with a request for a response from SFO Community Roundtable and the FAA:

The SERFR arrival procedure has generated well over **6** million noise reports to SFO since its implementation on March 5, 2015, and about 100,000 since March 16, 2022. To the SFO Roundtable and the FAA, I ask, **(1)** "What more can and will be done within the next 36 months to greatly reduce these numbers?" The prior Big Sur (BSR) procedure had almost zero noise reports in the five years prior to March 5, 2015. **A BSR overlay is clearly the best solution. (2) Please could the SFO Roundtable recommend that SERFR be converted to a BSR overlay as soon as possible, and please could the FAA agree to do so? (3) Please could United Airlines and other SFO airlines agree to finish installing** airflow deflectors on all of the Airbus A320 family of aircraft flying into SFO **as soon as possible, say, within 18 months?**

If Time-Based-Flow Management (TBFM) were implemented for SERFR and any other flight procedures using the same runway(s) as SERFR, I'd think TBFM could or would automatically adjust the Flight Mgmt Systems (FMSs) of nearly all aircraft headed for the relevant runway(s) so that aircraft on SERFR would arrive at the beginning of of the procedure with a perfect distance between them so that each could and would do a quiet Engine-Idle Descent (EID) or at least a quiet

Optimized Profile Descent (OPD) all the way down SERFR.

This would increase the predictability of the Air Traffic Control system with respect to SERFR and greatly reduce the need for noisy speed changes along the SERFR procedure. **(4)** All I've described **about TBFM** seems like it would decrease controller workload, decrease noise, and save fuel, correct? **(5)** To what extent has TBFM been utilized for SERFR over the past three months or so?

(6) Whether or not SERFR is converted to a BSR overlay, please could the SFO Roundtable recommend that the FAA make and implement plans to greatly increase the use of TBFM for SERFR so as to cover nearly all SERFR flights within 36 months and thus greatly reduce the number of noisy speed changes? If not, why not? **(7)** And to the FAA directly, would you be willing to make and implement such plans? If not, why not?

Thank you. Sincerely, Neil S., PhD

On Tue, May 31, 2022 at 6:53 AM Angela Montes <amontescardenas@smcgov.org> wrote:

Thank you,

We have received your comment, we will circulate to the membership and ensure it is posted online.

Kindly,

-AM

Angela Montes Cardenas

Administrative Secretary II

County of San Mateo

455 County Center, 2nd Floor

Redwood City, CA 94063

(650) 363-4220 T

(650) 363-4849 F

www.sanmateolafco.org

www.sforoundtable.org

From: Neil Schaefer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 5:03 AM
To: Angela Montes <amontescardenas@smcgov.org>
Subject: SFO Community Roundtable 6/1/22 Re Agenda item #9

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

5/31/22

Hello,

Re SFO Community Roundtable 6/1/22 **Agenda Item #9**, I submit the following along with a request for a response from SFO Community Roundtable and the FAA:

The SERFR arrival procedure has generated well over 5 million noise reports to SFO since its implementation on March 5, 2015, and about

100,000 since March 16, 2022. To the SFO Roundtable and the FAA, I ask, "What more can and will be done within the next 36 months to greatly reduce these numbers?" The prior Big Sur procedure had almost zero noise reports in the five years prior to March 5, 2015. When will the installation of airflow deflectors on the Airbus A320 family of aircraft flying into SFO be complete or at least 95% complete?

If Time-Based-Flow Management (TBFM) were implemented for SERFR and any other flight procedures using the same runway(s) as SERFR, I'd think TBFM could or would automatically adjust the Flight Mgmt Systems (FMSs) of nearly all aircraft headed for the relevant runway(s) so that aircraft on SERFR would arrive at the beginning of of the procedure with a perfect distance between them so that each could and would do a quiet Engine-Idle Descent (EID) or at least a quiet Optimized Profile Descent (OPD) all the way down SERFR.

This would increase the predictability of the Air Traffic Control system with respect to SERFR and greatly reduce the need for noisy speed changes along the SERFR procedure. All I've described seems like it would decrease controller workload, decrease noise, and save fuel, correct? To what extent has TBFM been utilized for SERFR over the past three months or so?

Please could the SFO Roundtable recommend that the FAA make and implement plans to greatly increase the use of TBFM for SERFR so as to cover nearly all SERFR flights within 36 months and thus greatly reduce the number of noisy speed changes? If not, why not? And to the FAA directly, would you be willing to make and implement such plans? If not, why not?

Thank you. Sincerely, Neil S., PhD

From: stefania.pietraszek
To: Angela.Montes
Subject: Agenda item #9 SFO-RT meeting June 1, 2022
Date: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 4:52:11 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

As one of the people who has been so dramatically and so negatively impacted by the FAA's random movement of the 35+ year old BSR flight path to SERFR, I want you to know I am STILL HERE. Every day of my life, and that of my family's, has been an effort to continue hanging on to our sanity. We have been, and continue to be, pummeled by jet noise every 3-5 minutes.

In the spirit of community engagement and with the belief that FAA was participating with integrity and honesty. – I spent countless hours attending the Select Committee on South Bay Arrival meetings. The Committee vote supported the return of SERFR to the BSR ground track. The viability and safety of this option had been assured by Glen Martin numerous times. That was in 2016. Now, 6 years later I ask what is the FAA doing to bring resolution to the SERFR problem? What – exactly – are the 'safety' issues the FAA mentioned in their presentation in July 2021 – the one where the

SERFR replacement BSR overlay route was displayed? How will the FAA engage with the affected public, on what schedule? What is the plan for a FIX – that doesn't require a full 'do over'. After all these years, simply ignoring us – or even worse – popping in every year or so - to say 'we've done nothing to help you' – is not acceptable. Provide details, provide timelines and provide a specific format for interfacing with the public. To the FAA – grant us the courtesy of participating in a town hall meeting– one of our Congressional representatives specifically invited you to do so! Why are you hiding from us????

From: [Vicki Miller](#)
To: [Angela Montes](#)
Cc: [Vicki Miller](#)
Subject: SFO Community Roundtable June 1 Agenda Item 9 SERFR Update
Date: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 5:32:28 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

In July of 2021 during the FAA workshop, it was stated that the developed procedure for the BSR Overlay was deemed safe. The reasons given to not move forward with the procedure were the 9 sub-criteria suggested by the Select Committee in their final report. As the 9 sub-criteria were suggested by lay people and not professional aviation personnel, and as the participants in the Select Committee process assumed that the FAA would develop a procedure that was flyable and updated with then current safety requirements, we are asking the SFO Roundtable to submit to the FAA an updated Select Committee proposal specifically for the BSR Overlay, to revisit the developed BSR Overlay procedure with the following requirements deleted: Eliminate the required 12,500 feet mean sea level cross at the Monterey Bay and allow as needed flexibility; eliminate the fly over less people request as the FAA feels they can not guarantee this ask; eliminate the MENLO restriction as this waypoint no longer exists; eliminate the ask for aircraft to maintain idle power all the way into the HEMAN waypoint. We ask that the SFO Roundtable request that the FAA revisit the fully developed BSR Overlay as soon as is possible in calendar year 2022 and that the FAA bring back to the Roundtable an Overlay procedure that is safe, as quiet as possible and satisfies as many requests from the Select Committee as is possible while maintaining current safety requirements.

Sincerely,

Vicki Miller, Co-Chair

Save Our Skies Santa Cruz